

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,445	08/21/2003	George M. Laurence	P00755-US-01 7984 (21348.0001) EXAMINER	
75	90 02/24/2005			
Alexander D. Forman ICE MILLER			CARRILLO, BIBI SHARIDAN	
One American Square			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Box 82001			1746	
Indianapolis, IN 46282-0002			DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\overline{}$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/645,445	GEORGE LAURENCE
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sharidan Carrillo	1746
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Au 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original transfer of the correction of the original transfer of the correction of the correction of the original transfer of the correction of the corre	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/21/2003.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Po 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/645,445 Page 2

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 20 are indefinite because it is unclear how the cleaning system can be a low pressure if a "pressure less than about 50 lbs" reads on value of zero.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 1746

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frauenfeld (4025362) in view Bui (6578777).

Frauenfeld teaches cleaning heat exchange surfaces of heat transfer plates by cleaning with a row of low-pressure washing nozzles 22 (Fig.1). In col. 1, lines 1-25, Frauenfeld teaches cleaning agents typically include steam, water, and air. Frauenfeld further teaches saturated steam in combination with compressed air. In reference to claims 1 and 12, Frauenfeld fails to teach a pressure of less than 50 psi. Bui teaches a low pressure spray nozzle adapted and configured to produce a uniform spray of small fluid droplets using a low pressure supply of air and fluid. In col. 5, lines 1-10, Bui teaches a low pressure of 0.2 to 5.0psi. It would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to have modified the method of Frauenfeld to include a pressure of 0.2-5.0psi since Bui teaches a low pressure nozzle having pressures within the range of 0.2-5.0psi and both Frauenfeld and Bui teaches the use of low pressure spray nozzles. In reference to claims 2 and 13, Frauenfeld in view of Bui fails to teach the diameter of the nozzle. However, in col. 1, lines 60-65, Frauenfeld teaches that the nozzles are each dimensioned to produce a directional output jet of high kinetic energy. In view of the teachings of Frauenfeld, it would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to

Art Unit: 1746

change the diameter size of the nozzle since the change in size of an article is held to obvious to the skilled artisan (In re Rose 105 USPQ 237, CCPA 1955).

In reference to claims 3 and 14, refer to Bui et al. In reference to claims 4-7, and 15-16, Frauenfeld teaches steam in combination with air. In reference to claims 8-11 and 17-20, Frauenfeld in view of Bui et al. fail to teach the recited velocity or volume. It would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to increase the velocity and volume in order to effectively remove contaminants from the heat exchange surface.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Albers et al. teach a soot removal blower. Frauenfeld, Minard, and Dicke teaches a method of cleaning a heat exchanging surface. Lyons teaches cleaning heat exchanger coils. Jameel teaches a sootblower.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharidan Carrillo whose telephone number is 571-272-1297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:00a.m-2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,445

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sharidan Carrillo Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

bsc

SHARIDAN CARRILO SHARIDAN EXAMINER